

AB 32 Environmental Justice Advisory Committee
Location: Sacramento, CA
Dates: February 14-15, 2017

Environmental Justice Advisory Committee (EJAC) Member Attendees: February 14, 2017

Colin Bailey (CB), Tom Frantz (TF), Katie Valenzuela Garcia (KVG), Sekita Grant (SG), Kevin Hamilton (KH), Luis Olmedo (LO), Mari Rose Taruc (MRT), Eleanor Torres (ET), Martha Dina Argüello (MDA), Kemba Shakur (KS), and Rey León (RL)

Air Resources Board (ARB) and Other State Agency Attendees

Trish Johnson (TJ), Floyd Vergara (FV), Dave Mallory, Alvaro Alvarado, Shelby Livingston, Rajinder Sahota (RS), Jakub Zielkiewicz, Stephanie Kato, Jose Saldana, and Johnnie Raymond

EJAC Member Attendees: February 15, 2017

Gisele Fong (GF), Tom Frantz (TF), Katie Valenzuela-Garcia (KVG), Kevin Hamilton (KH), Luis Olmedo (LO), Mari Rose Taruc (MRT), Eleanor Torres (ET), Kemba Shakur (KS), Rey León (RL), Martha Dina Argüello (MDA), and Colin Bailey (CB)

ARB and Other State Agency Attendees

Trish Johnson (TJ), Dave Mallory, Floyd Vergara (FV), Stephanie Kato, Jakub Zielkiewicz

Facilitation Support

Stephanie Lucero, Facilitator, Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP)
Justin Almase-Ruschell, Note-taking support, CCP
Mark Wilson, Technical Writer

Action Items

February 14th

1. RS will confirm with Dr. Rudolph if race and ethnicity disparity is or can be considered in the Health Impact Assessment.
2. RS and MDA agreed to follow-up on convene an interagency workgroup to discuss regional data and understanding health impacts.
 - a. MDA will prepare a short statement regarding the proposed workgroup and coordinate with RS to identify those to invite.
3. EJAC agreed to review the Mapping Document before the February 15 meeting and clarify whether the details provided are sufficient for incorporation in the entire Cross-Link Table.
4. KS will work with ARB to schedule a call for the Investments Work Group to discuss the percentage of the budget allocated for urban forestry.
5. EJAC agreed to do the following:
 - a. Review the [Mapping Document](#) presented on February 14, 2017, identify what they would like to see more of with regard to the Cross-Link Table, and include

footnotes and links to Appendices, so that people can see what the EJAC had intended.

- b. Refine sector presentations to ARB, targeting presentations of 1 minute.
- c. Identify Lead presenters for the sector work groups.
- d. Review the [Draft EJAC Declaration](#) presented at the January 18, 2017 EJAC meeting.

February 15th

1. CCP will make the discussed revisions to the Declaration and share with the entire EJAC.
2. TJ will email EJAC members hosting community meetings a PDF or JPEG of the “Community Flyer” used to promote previous EJAC community meetings.
3. CCP will email EJAC members the compiled notes from the August 2016 Community Workshops.
4. CCP will email EJAC members the “List of 700 EJAC Recommendations” from summer 2016.
5. CCP will email EJAC members the agreed upon agendas, including goals, for the March 2017 EJAC community meetings.
6. CCP will email EJAC members the California State University’s, College of Continuing Educations contact information for logistical planning purposes related to the March 2017 EJAC community meetings.
7. ARB will distribute comment cards throughout the community meetings.
8. ARB will provide an email link for participants’ comments at the community meetings.
9. ARB will attempt to complete the Cross-Link Table and deliver it to the EJAC no later than February 22, 2017.
10. CCP will follow up with KH regarding the date and location for the San Joaquin Valley EJAC community meeting.
11. LO will confirm if he is hosting an EJAC community meeting in Brawley, CA with TJ by February 17, 2017.

Materials

Appendix A: [Proposed Scoping Plan Presentation](#)

Appendix B: [ARB Mapping Document](#)

Appendix C: [Draft Slides for March 2017 EJAC Community Meetings](#)

Appendix D: [Revised Comments to the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment \(OEHHA\) Report](#)

Day 1, February 14, 2017

Welcome and Introductions

Stephanie Lucero opened the meeting by reviewing the day's agenda, materials, ground rules and logistics. Ms. Lucero reiterated the goals of the meeting to establish a deeper understanding of the Proposed Scoping Plan scenarios, review and discuss the Mapping Document prepared by ARB, and prepare for the EJAC meeting with ARB on February 15, 2017.

Ms. Lucero then commenced both in-person introductions as well as participants joining by phone.

ARB Overview of Proposed Scoping Plan

TJ presented the Overview of the Proposed Scoping Plan. RS led the Question & Answer portion of the presentation. See Appendix A for the handout. Key elements are as follows:

- The 2030 Targets are one of many objectives the Proposed Scoping Plan (Appendix A, slides 3-4) seeks to achieve.
- California (the State) seeks to ensure funds are available to develop an Integrated and Working Lands Action Plan (Appendix A, slide 9).
- The Proposed Scenario achieves the most benefits and objectives, most efficiently. There are too many uncertainties to ensure success with the Alternatives.

Questions and General Discussion Related to ARB's Overview of Proposed Scoping Plan:

- MRT sought clarification regarding the continuation of Cap-and-Trade (slide 7).
 - RS: The proposed plan includes the current Cap-and-Trade program. ARB will evaluate options for offsets to determine the viability of adjusting the usage limit. Any adjustment will be a part of the regulatory process. The caps have a decline which are commensurate with the statewide target of 40% reduction by 2030.
 - ARB and MRT confirmed that the offset limits range from 0 to 8%.
- KVG: What comes first, the Scoping Plan, or the regulations to incorporate programs into the Scoping Plan? The response to this may impact the Scoping Plan process.
 - RS: The Scoping Plan does not trigger any requirements. ARB is currently identifying the best path to reach the 2030 target. If the Scoping Plan is adopted, the proposed programs will be incorporated. The ARB Board will review any Cap-and-Trade amendments in the spring of 2017. The Scoping Plan can influence which proposals and measures the State adopts.
 - KVG: The degree to which the EJAC can make recommendations informs changes to Cap-and-Trade after 2020.
 - CB affirmed that the Scoping Plan initiates change so current regulations do not have to be accepted as status quo.

- MRT: Air quality is one of the primary goals of [AB 32](#). Are there any air quality assessments in the benefits and drawbacks of the alternatives to Cap-and-Trade?
 - RS: Table 3.1 (page 57) in the [Proposed Scoping Plan](#) identifies the measure and reductions. We decided to reorganize the table by alternatives and by the Proposed Scoping Plan.
 - MRT: Several Board members expressed interest in including a health analysis in CEQA at the January ARB Board meeting.
 - RS: ARB addressed this matter at the February 9, 2016 workshop. An analysis is underway and will be released before the Final Draft of the Scoping Plan.
 - CB: Will the analysis address race and ethnicity disparity?
 - RS will confirm this with those at the February 9th workshop on this matter, specifically, Dr. Rudolph.
 - EJAC recommended that presentations on the Proposed Scoping Plan should emphasize the air quality goals and assessments in their presentations in order to message the importance of these issues to the ARB. EJAC further emphasized the importance of this messaging for their Community Workshops.
 - ARB will review the presentations include some additional language in response to this request.
- MDA: Recommended and volunteered to form a work group consisting of OEHHA Staff, Dr. Linda Rudolph from California Department of Public Health (CDPH), ARB Staff, and EJAC members to collaborate on this issue.
 - RS: This may combine with some of our efforts towards AB 197.
 - RS and MDA agreed to follow-up on this idea and to convene this group and pull together regional data and understanding.
 - MDA will prepare a short statement regarding the proposed workgroup and coordinate with RS to identify those to invite.
- KH: Carbon Tax (slides 15-16) is not excluding the regulatory process in the same way criteria pollutants are regulated. This could apply as the second half of the scenario.
 - RS: Are you suggesting Alternative 1 include a Carbon Tax (i.e. combining some of the alternatives?)
 - KH: Relate the tax to the polluting industry rather than the general economy.
 - RS: In order to meet the 2030 reductions, widespread reductions across the entire economy are being considered.
 - KH: A tax or fee structure on participants of the emissions is needed, commensurate with the amount of emissions generated. Resulting dollars from the tax would go back into the economy and create employment opportunities. This requires a transition in the economy to a newer, more robust, cleaner economy; current industry, and today's economy will make necessary adjustments and still be relevant. Furthermore, we already pay criteria pollutant taxes and fees.
 - RS: This idea sounds like an expansion of existing environmental regulations in the State. This is another consideration, passing associated costs through the economy. The Economic modeling ARB has conducted mimics potential impact on the overall economy.

- TF: The refinery measure with 20% improvements in efficiency reductions yields direct criteria pollutant reductions. Why was the refinery measure chosen over other sectors, such as oil and gas production?
 - RS: The refinery measure was something ARB had access to, based on existing data. As the largest stationary source and sector of GHGs, refineries provide a logical starting point.
- TF: Highlighting the lowest emitters within each sector of the Scoping Plan sets industry targets for other producers.
- KVG: How is Staff addressing the gap in data related to [SB 375](#) targets and the Natural and Working Lands methodology?
 - RS: This is a separate and parallel process, and not part of the Scoping Plan. ARB is working towards developing a comprehensive strategy for the Natural and Working Lands sector. This is ongoing and is outside of the Scoping Plan. The Natural and Working Lands sector is outside of the target and is not included in SB 32.
- KVG: Can you expand upon SB 375 in Land Use?
 - RS: SB 375 targets do not reach the 15% reduction. ARB has flagged this as an area to work towards reaching reductions, and believes successful strategies can be implemented at the State level.
 - KVG: My interpretation of SB 375 is that ARB has the authority to demand reductions within existing law. The concern is that 2020 targets will not be set and accounted for in the Scoping Plan.

ARB Overview of the Mapping Document

Floyd Vergara (FV) presented the Overview of the Mapping Document. See Appendix B for the handout. FV asked EJAC if the Mapping Document was a preferred response to the EJAC's request for clarification on how their Recommendations were incorporated into the Proposed Scoping Plan, and if not, why.

Questions and General Discussion Related to ARB's Overview of the Mapping Document:

- KVG: It would have been useful for ARB to invite input from EJAC members prior to presenting the document. The EJAC would still like the Cross Link Table, it was requested in December.
- FV: The intent behind the mapping document is to apply the same approach to all 140 EJAC recommendations. The main goal is to be more responsive to the EJAC recommendations. Staff felt the current Cross Link Table was insufficient.
- KVG: ARB references other studies that are not complete yet in the mapping document, related to specific concerns within the Scoping Plan. In this case, ARB is not even referring to the Scoping Plan. The intent of the Scoping Plan is to ensure issues are addressed sooner rather than later. The Scoping Plan creates a road map for SB 32. Waiting for other groups or studies to complete is not adequate for the Scoping Plan.

- FV: Staff can consider this for elements of the Cross Link Table and reference specific pages. FV invited KVG to let him know where more dates and references are needed and requested examples of successful metrics in current programs.
- KVG: The completion of the Cross Link Table is time sensitive and has been since December.
- FV Requested EJAC members read the mapping document, offer specific changes to include in the Cross Link Table, and any other suggestions. ARB's goal is to complete the Cross Link Table prior to EJAC community meetings.
- MRT: Inspiration for the Cross Link Table came from the 2014 EJAC. The EJAC still needs the complete list of which EJAC recommendations are included in the Scoping Plan.
- KH: ARB could annotate the Scoping Plan, using Appendix A for the Cross Link Table.
- FV: Perhaps the EJAC will change its mind regarding the mapping document, once members have had a chance to review it fully. In response to KVG, for example on Page 3 of the mapping document, under #4: Staff wants to provide more complete responses to EJAC recommendations.
- KVG provided a number of examples where she felt the Mapping Document was incomplete. For example, #23 on page 11 and #25 on page 12 where biomass is still included despite EJAC highlighting this as a concern and something to remove since December.
- FV: It is ARB's duty to implement EJAC recommendations. The Cross Link Table is useful and provides a convenient way to navigate the Scoping Plan. ARB's goal is to complete the Cross Link Table prior to the EJAC community meetings.
- KVG: The complete Cross Link Table is general protocol, it helps show communities how ARB listened to the EJAC. This process is about best practices and having respect for the time and effort the EJAC has put forth.
- FV emphasized that ARB takes the EJAC and its recommendations very seriously. Staff is struggling with the in-between that exists in the response to EJAC recommendations. It is never simply a matter of "yes or no." Staff wants to provide EJAC members and their communities a better understanding of how everything is working with regard to meeting stated targets. This in-between is what the Mapping Document tried to address.
- KVG urged the ARB to provide full responses to their inquiries and felt that to date the EJAC has only received partial answers.
- EJAC agreed to review the Mapping Document before the February 15 meeting and clarify whether the details provided are sufficient for incorporation in the entire Cross Link Table.

Questions and General Discussion Related to EJAC's Preparation for the February 15, 2017 Joint Meeting with the ARB Board:

EJAC members were asked to think through their objectives for meeting with the ARB. Identify what topics to review with the ARB, and narrow down how to present their concerns succinctly in order to facilitate a dialogue between ARB and the EJAC. EJAC members discussed their

primary concerns and examples of issues on the ground to share with the ARB. Highlights of EJAC concerns are as follows:

1. The role of the EJAC is to ground truth the local impacts of the Scoping Plan and ARB programs.
2. Overarching policy issues for the Scoping Plan are:
 - a. Improved Public Health
 - b. Improved Air Quality in Environmental Justice (EJ) communities.
 - c. Clean energy economic opportunities for EJ communities
3. Implementation of the Scoping Plan cannot result in unintended negative impacts to EJ communities in the form of:
 - a. Air Quality
 - b. Public Health
 - c. Economic opportunities (where money is spend, who receives it, etc.), prevent displacement
 - d. Economic impacts (detrimental consequences to local EJ economies)
 - e. Empower local control, governance, and implementation

The discussion from EJAC was as follows:

- KVG: We need to provide the Board with an idea of where we are now by offering broad feedback while honing in on specific EJAC recommendations, how and where they are incorporated in the Scoping Plan, and what is still missing that is of high priority in each community. This requires the complete Cross Link Table for reference at some level of specificity, so communities can hear how their recommendations were incorporated.
- MDA: Communities want to hear how this will improve air quality and economic opportunity in the community. How exactly is this going to be implemented? This is important for Staff and for Staff to do with the EJAC.
- ET: Programs are being implemented in the communities already, with both positive and negative impacts.
- KS: We need to determine who is responsible for what, how money is being spent, who is receiving the money, and who is not.
- ET: KS and I are having to quantify everything we are doing for grants it is very time consuming.
- EJAC discussed how best to address the budgeting concerns in terms of what percentage of budgets are allocated to local EJ programs like Urban Forestry.
 - KS will work with ARB to schedule a call for the Investments Work Group to discuss the percentage of the budget allocated for urban forestry.
- RL: Increased coordination makes projects more tangible.
- ET: Success is not measured simply by getting money into the communities.
- MDA: Where are the air quality and greening benefits? We need to show our communities investments and what is happening to air quality. Do we consider the adaptive management plan to identify targeted intervention?

- RL: Relate developments to cultural transformation as well. California's culture should be able to sustain the models.
 - EJAC member discussed whether ARB was the best venue for cultural awareness.
 - ET: San Bernardino has a designed program to meet the Scoping Plan's requirements and issues. Agencies should work collaboratively, in order to strategically address needs within communities.
- KS: With regard to displacement and institutional racism recommendations, on the ground it is hard to compete with outside entities that have advantages when it comes to receiving grants. These are unintended consequences of the Scoping Plan. On the ground experiences should encourage ARB responsiveness and incorporation when developing policy and documents.
 - MDA: Would like to see the Requests for Proposals (RFP's) and evaluations within the communities. There is a displacement score.
- MRT: Agrees that EJAC and ARB have different "World views," in terms of how the Scoping Plan is discussed as a body, and how the EJAC is engaging its communities. The EJAC is trying to create a set of policies and programs in the Scoping Plan which provide cleaner air to communities and make them healthier overall. The final goal of the EJAC should be to achieve air quality improvements and public health improvements in our communities in the Final Draft of the Scoping Plan—within each sector.
- ET: The EJAC should focus on clean energy components of the Scoping Plan.
- SG: The EJAC needs to be proactive and set up meetings with Staff to identify sources of funding. We need transparency moving forward with regard to funding. We need a process mechanism for folks with grievances to raise concerns with the State. The EJAC cannot be blind to investments and only focus on health impacts. When talking about how to address concerns we cannot ignore the economic consequences.
- MDA: Wants to foster the ground-truthing component of the relationship with the EJAC, ARB Staff and the ARB Board.
- ET: There is a natural tendency for agencies and institutions to look at environmental Justice (EJ) Communities as a liability. They are not. They can be tremendous resources. Staff needs to embrace this idea, and can make the program work.
- KS: There is a misconception that poor communities need to be saved. Local communities should have local control of outsiders coming in and saving the community. This connects to the economic opportunities theme. Local communities need to be part of the development. This was included in several of the EJAC recommendations and needs to be filtered into the how and implementation of policy.
- RL: This is challenging. Take High Speed Rail, for example. The City of Fresno just received \$70 Million, but this does not do anything for other communities where unemployment rates are much higher. Local skill sets have not caught up to available work and projects.
- KS: The same challenge applies for urban forestry. We compete with unions at the City level.
- MRT: We have to be able to see how this will work and imagine what we want these programs to look like. This occurs in the implementation phase. Using the Cap-and-

Trade Scenario, local communities are not part of the scenario vs. another mechanism for promoting clean energy, such as a carbon tax or carbon fee. Local communities need improved training. Use Just Transition for workers, and attach air quality and a public health analysis for regular benchmarks and targets at the local level. We also need to identify where EJ Communities would have preference within the Scoping Plan. The current scenario Staff is proposing is not best for communities, and needs to incorporate specific EJAC recommendations.

- KVG: During our introductions, each EJAC member should talk about what they are experiencing in their communities. This gives the Board added context for what the EJAC is interested in, and offers them an opportunity to see what we experience. For example, “This is why we are concerned about Cap-and-Trade, and this is what we see as more beneficial and why, within our communities.” This approach gives members an opportunity to frame each segment, what is important, and where it came from. Furthermore, it allows the Board a chance to connect with individual concerns.
- Each EJAC member agreed to develop a short introduction and provide an example of local issues and how they see the Scoping plan addressing local concerns.
- TF: For the Board meeting, emphasize a “Do no harm” approach with regulations and the Scoping Plan. Our first priority should be identifying co-benefits; do not reinforce inefficiencies; do not propose projects which may have immediate benefits for meeting the 2030 target, but which have no place in 2050.
- MDA: We need to start offering some alternatives to what the Board seems to be settling on.
- EJAC members agreed on the following sector leadership teams:
 - a) Overarching Issues: TF, MRT, KVG, RL
 - b) Energy, Green Building and Water: RL, KH, CB, ET
 - c) Industry: MRT, TF, MDA
 - d) Transportation: KH, KVG, RL, GF
 - e) Natural and Working Lands: TF, KH, KS
- EJAC members agreed to vote on the Draft EJAC Declaration on February 15, 2017.

Public Comment

- Chuck Mills, Director, Public Policy & Grants, ReLeaf: I came today to try to get perspective on how the EJAC approaches issues within the Scoping Plan. I appeal to EJAC members TF, KS, and KH to look at making natural resources more of a priority within the 2030 Scoping Plan. Folks in the natural resources field are very concerned about the timeframe components of the Scoping Plan, and the Lawrence Berkeley Lab methodology. The EJAC recommendations need to be fully integrated in the Scoping Plan, and should include active transportation and infrastructure. Including recommendations on the “Vibrant Community Study” would be helpful. Overall, there is a concern that the Natural and Working Lands sector will not be considered with regard to the 2030 target. Stakeholders are concerned about this moving into 2018 and beyond.

- Jonathan Changus, Member Services Manager, Northern California Power Agency: I work with members on developing energy efficiency—programs designed towards customer facing and resources. I welcome the opportunity to address concerns in my community. I have recommendations and welcome the chance to collaborate with the EJAC. Our group will be administering a lot of the programs the EJAC is presenting.
- Andre Templeman, Executive Director, Alpha Inception: I work in markets. As an unintended consequence, if regulations point to facility specific carbon dioxide, once you have regulations and put a price on carbon, the regulations could fall apart. The EJAC could target the criteria pollutants you are worried about and require that they lose Cap-and-Trade benefits if they do not meet targets. The current Cap-and-Trade market can be changed very easily to meet the needs of EJ communities.

Wrap and Preparation for February 15, 2017

EJAC agreed to do the following:

- Review the [Mapping Document](#) presented on February 14, 2017, identify what they would like to see more of with regard to the Cross-Link Table, and include footnotes and links to Appendices, so that people can see what the EJAC had intended.
- Refine sector presentations to ARB, targeting presentations of 1 minute.
- Identify presenters for the sector work groups.
- Review the [Draft EJAC Declaration](#) presented at the January 18, 2017 EJAC meeting.

Day 2, February 15, 2017

SL started the meeting by welcoming everyone, and provided a review of the agenda, and the meeting goals. She then confirmed that the EJAC was at a quorum, and invited EJAC members to vote on the previous day's proposed changes to the Draft EJAC Declaration.

Questions and General Discussion Related to the Proposed Changes to the Draft EJAC Declaration:

- ET expressed concern regarding whether there was enough conclusive evidence for the EJAC to vote on this matter and requested additional discussion.
- LO requested clarification regarding whether members voted as EJAC members or as individuals representing their organizations.
 - MDA: We are voting as EJAC members.
 - TF: This is an EJAC resolution, and would come from the EJAC. Others could also approve it for themselves personally, or their organizations in the future.
- LO clarified that he felt that the title should be altered to "The Environmental Justice Advisory Committee's Declaration in Support of Carbon Pricing Reform in California."
- KS felt that some of the, "Whereas" statements were conflicting. For example, Numbers 8, 9, 10, and 12 appear to conflict with each other.
 - TF: Finds the document is coherent as is.

- MDA: The document acknowledges reality and highlights other problems with Carbon Trading. #4 should reference the entire life cycle of fossil fuels, not simply the “burning” of fossil fuels.
- ET: This is a collective statement and members have not had the opportunity to pass the document through the communities. Much of San Bernardino County has been disengaged from the process until recently. She requested additional time to review this document with her community before voting in favor.
- KVG: This document reflects feedback the EJAC received from community workshops. Given the time sensitive nature, it is important we voice these concerns. Doing so reflects the fact that we have held workshops and engaged our communities appropriately.
- TF: Requested changing the second declaration from “fight” to “oppose” on page 2, after #21.
- TF: Moved to take a vote. Invited members who did not choose to approve the proposed changes at this time to submit an alternative statement.
- The EJAC was at quorum, and voted. EJAC members who were not present will be invited to sign on to the declaration after the fact. GF, TF, KVG, KH, MRT and MDA voted to adopt the Declaration with the changes requested above. LO, ET and KS abstained from voting.
 - The next step is for EJAC members who were not present, or abstained from voting, or their related organizations, to offer comments on the Declaration, or to agree with the vote after the fact.
 - CCP will send the revised Declaration to the EJAC.

Questions and General Discussion Related to the Mapping Document:

- The EJAC has tentatively agreed and recommended to ARB that the Cross Link Table format is preferred to the Mapping format and that the EJAC seeks input on all EJAC recommendations presented in December 2016.
- MRT: Requests the Cross Link Table be completed on or before February 22, 2017 (one week prior to the first EJAC community workshop in Sacramento on March 1, 2017). Having the completed Cross Link Table allows EJAC members to share with their communities exactly what happened with the ideas and suggestions community members offered for the Scoping Plan.
- FV confirmed that TJ, Stephanie Kato, Jakub Zielkiewicz, Dave Mallory, and RS are the primary staff working on the Cross Link table. FV agreed to target February 22, 2017 for completion of the Cross Link Table.

Questions and General Discussion Related to the EJAC Community Meetings:

- EJAC members agreed to use the community meetings as an opportunity to highlight the current status of the Scoping Plan, where recommendations from the communities were or were not included in the Scoping Plan, and why.

- EJAC members agreed to identify items within each scenario and sector which require further revision.
- EJAC members agree to work with community members to prioritize items of importance.
- ET: Would like to present the adopted EJAC Declaration to the communities and discuss the scenarios, in order for the communities to determine the best outcome.
- KS: Communities want to know where the funding is. Most people coming to the meetings seek assistance for their organizations.
- MDA: Los Angeles and Long Beach had broad discussions about health improvements, rather than economics. The Cross Link Table is useful, but there may be another analytical step. For example, we could offer “buckets of categories” to discuss at individual tables.
- KVG: Display comments from previous community meetings, and show how *their ideas* were incorporated into the Proposed Scoping Plan. Furthermore, identify which recommendations were not incorporated and emphasize outstanding issues of importance. Look at the August 2016 community meeting notes as a guide for what was discussed in order to highlight incorporation, or non-incorporation, into the Proposed Scoping Plan from those main themes.
- MRT: The EJAC members presenting at the community meetings need the previous notes from the facilitators of the August 2016 meetings, in order to cross reference what was discussed and the points of emphasis.
- CCP will email EJAC members the compiled notes from the August 2016 Community Workshop. Each EJAC community meeting host, requested to maintain individual notes from their World Café table top facilitators.
- CCP will email EJAC members the “List of 700 EJAC Recommendations” from summer 2016.
- KH: We have two hours to present to the community, to show which recommendations are incorporated, which are not, and to help lead a discussion on why the recommendations are, or are not incorporated. Staff will be presenting this material primarily, and will need to present substantive answers to any outstanding concerns the community may have. A sector by sector approach is most efficient.
- CB: EJAC members need to examine inter-regional impacts, and need to build inter-regional environmental justice solidarity.
- MDA: The meetings must inform the community as to what is at stake. We can build an inter-state connection for various scenarios by highlighting the results of the scenarios. For example, Cap-and-Trade vs. Carbon Tax: What it means, and who it effects. This provides the community a way to identify whether implementing specific recommendations moves them closer to reaching their goals and whether it results in overall improvements for that community.
- KVG: It is beneficial to show communities the trade-offs. They should benefit from the knowledge and context EJAC members used to inform their recommendations.

- LO: We need to know the audience. Some people need more background than others. Two tracks (beginner and advanced) would be ideal. Bring them back together as a group to close the meeting.
- The EJAC agreed upon the following times and dates for EJAC community meetings:
 - March 1, 2017: Sacramento, CA. Hosted by KVG and CB from 6:00 P.M. to 8:00 P.M.
 - March 13, 2017: Colton, CA. Hosted by ET from 6:00 P.M. to 8:00 P.M.
 - March 15, 2017: Los Angeles, CA. Hosted by MA and GF from 6:00 P.M. to 8:00 P.M.
 - Regarding the San Joaquin Valley meeting: CCP will follow up with KH, to identify the best day and time for the community meeting. RL, TF, and KH will host the meeting in the San Joaquin Valley. KH is waiting to hear back from the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District to confirm the date and time.
 - LO will confirm with TJ by February 17, 2017 whether he will host a meeting in Brawley, CA.
- The EJAC expressed desire to conduct a Statewide Webinar on March 22, 2017 from 12:00 P.M. to 2:00 P.M. Satellite locations for the Statewide Webinar allow EJAC members to host and receive comments on a local level, providing one last chance for public comment for those who could not attend a workshops in person. The public will be able to view the webinar remotely.
- MRT: This relates to the timeline. EJAC members need to know when to submit final comments to ARB for the Final Scoping Plan. Requests that the Final Scoping Plan be released after the March 29-30, 2017 EJAC meetings in Los Angeles.
- TJ shared that the current deadline for the Final Scoping Plan is April 2017.¹
- EJAC agreed to the following meeting goals for their community workshops:
 - Participants understand which EJAC recommendations are in the Scoping Plan and which were not incorporated into the Scoping Plan.
 - Participants understand how EJAC recommendations are incorporated into the Scoping Plan.
 - Participants help EJAC identify additional community needs and develop additional recommendations for the EJAC to deliver to ARB.
- EJAC agreed to the following Draft Agenda for their Community Workshops:
 1. EJAC overview of the summer 2016 workshop process.
 2. ARB overview of the current Proposed Scoping Plan. [Proposed Scoping Plan Presentation](#)
 3. Discuss which EJAC recommendations were or were not included in the Proposed Scoping Plan
 4. Discussion Tables (or World Café). Options for discussion topics are as follows:
 - a. Alternatives to Cap-and-Trade could represent the discussion topics at the World Café tables
 - b. Proposed Scoping Plan sectors

¹ The timeline for the Scoping Plan was extended. The final Scoping Plan is anticipated in May 2017.

- EJAC agreed to conduct discussion tables, similar to the August 2016 community meetings. Participants will be organized at tables via sector topics for in depth discussion. Tables will be added at the various meetings as needed.
 - KVG: Each table's facilitator will provide a short report to the plenary, along with written comment cards from participants, to be delivered to ARB.
 - MRT: Updated EJAC recommendations to the Scoping Plan will be available at each meeting.
 - MDA: How will EJAC members capture community input at the meetings, and how will that input get relayed for the March 29-30, 2017 EJAC meetings and incorporated into the Final Scoping Plan? Members discussed maintaining notes from each table and including those in the Workshop Summary.
 - KVG: An idea is to have all input from the March EJAC community meetings synthesized into a chart to use for the March 29-30, 2017 EJAC meetings. Full comments could be included as Appendices in the Final Scoping Plan.
 - CCP stressed the need to have these comments organized by each discussion table and provided to note takers for synthesis.
- Technical writer recommended synthesizing comments. Referencing those recommendations that are already included in the Proposed Scoping Plan, and identify a more manageable subset of issues to address that are not in the Proposed Scoping Plan.
- EJAC members discussed the concept of a gallery walk and instructional options. It was agreed that each EJAC member will be responsible for implementing these concepts.
 - Gallery Walk/Virtual Community Tour -- a virtual gallery walk related to the implementation of policy enactment, organized via the sectors of the Scoping Plan.
- GF: The EJAC needs to provide interfacing for the community regarding opportunities and challenges, and how to translate them into recommendations for specific policy.
- EJAC requested that ARB provide the following resources and handouts for each Community Workshop:
 - Completed Cross Link Table.
 - Proposed Scoping Plan Presentation.
 - Copies of the "Community Flyer" used to promote previous EJAC community meetings.
 - Comment cards.
 - Email link for participants' comments to ARB.

Questions and General Discussion Related to the EJAC ARB Board Presentations on February 15, 2017:

- The EJAC agreed to target one minute for sector presentations to the ARB Board.
- The EJAC agreed to consider economic opportunities, improved air quality, and improved public health as driving themes for the ARB Board presentations. Related items include: Looking for co-benefits and providing unintended consequences.

- The EJAC agreed to cover the following items and messages for each sector:
 - Overarching Issues (MRT, KVG, TF, RL): Present items in terms of scale, including the benefits and harms of the scenarios as they have been presented to the EJAC. Place emphasis on the need for a clear, transformative vision for 2050.
 - Energy, Green Buildings, and Water (KH, RL, CB, ET): Place emphasis on linking green buildings to job opportunities, public health, and clean air. Retrofits are necessary in order to enhance the potential of green buildings. Regarding energy, focus on decentralizing systems in order to transition away from fossil fuels. Existing pumping systems need to be retrofitted as well to run on electricity vs. diesel fuel and natural gas. Emphasize solar energy along with the request that California purchase clean energy from out of State whenever possible. New electrical needs and demands in the State allow for innovation and incorporation of renewable energies, preferably solar.
 - Industry (MRT, TF, MA): Continue the theme of benefits and harms from the Overarching Issues sector, highlighting early findings of the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) Report, “Tracking and Evaluation of Benefits and Impacts of Greenhouse Gas Limits in Disadvantaged Communities: Initial Report.” The Scoping Plan must have a greater positive impact in and around our communities—especially those adjacent to oil fields and production. A clear and transformative vision for 2050 is needed in the Scoping Plan to accommodate EJAC recommendations, and introduce measurable positive changes in our communities.
 - Transportation (KH, GF, KVG, RL): KH Read the overarching principles outlined in the EJAC Transportation recommendations.
 - Natural and Working Lands (TF, KS, KH): Urban forestry will consider the Overarching Issues also. Recycle organic biomass and place it in the soil. The Scoping Plan needs to be sustainable through 2050. Dairy digesters are a prime example; recycle manure properly for use, rather than placing it elsewhere as an unsustainable solution.

Closing Remarks

Ms. Lucero closed the meeting by reminding EJAC members to review and practice their sector presentations for the afternoon meeting with the ARB Board.

Public Comment

There was none.